

Meeting discussions from the 6th meeting of the LRM Standards Committee.
Wednesday, October 20, 2004
notes by Erik Hubl

Attendance: John Beran, Steve Cobb, Erik Hubl, Bill Sheldon, Dan Silvis, Larry Zink

Both Jim Koch and Gail Knapp were absent.

The meeting began at 1:10 PM. There were no corrections to the minutes. Larry provided us with a *draft standards summary sheet* (10-20-04 version) that outlined the current rewording of the various sections. He also provided us with document titled 'Draft Key Points of LRM and Preservation Legislation Compromise Version VI.'

Larry was able to dialogue with Jim Brown, State Surveyor about several important items. (Jim, by the way, will be retiring soon. His many years of service to Nebraska and the surveying community are very much appreciated. Thank you and enjoy)!

Item A – Datum: The LRM committee advocates the explicit use of NAD83 and NAVD88.

Item B - Projection: The legislation for the Nebraska Plane Coordinate System specifically states metric units. We're not sure if it is worth crafting revised legislation so Jim suggested that we include a statement in our standard that says units may be either expressed in meters or feet.

Item C - Geodetic Control: The revised text in Larry's handout is good as written. It basically states that local geodetic frameworks should be tied to the National Spatial Reference System.

Item D – Public Land Survey System Control: This revised text is rather lengthy but it basically states that section corners should form the local geodetic framework for a county. (Quarter section corners were removed). Much discussion took place about perceived problems between adjoining counties and the potential for multiple monuments defining those section corners.

Steve Cobb from the State Surveyors Office entered the meeting at this point and we continued with a healthy discussion of some of these issues.

Counties usually work out between themselves the common boundary issues. Lancaster for instance works with Saunders and Gage in resolving common points. The line between Douglas and Sarpy is known to have many offsets due to un-agreed upon corner locations.

Steve C. felt that if counties meet a certain specification, they should all mosaic together anyway. He felt the greater emphasis of applying geodetic control should be made in the urban areas as opposed to the rural areas.

In discussing the uses of different projection systems, it was felt that as long as it can be re-projected into the Nebraska Plane System then that would be acceptable.

Item E – PLSS Base Map: This revised text was changed after discussion with Jim B. It removes emphasis on the use of the GMM product and instead seeks coordination with the State Surveyors Office when developing GPS PLSS coordinates. In addition it recognizes that the SSO maintains the repository database of all PLSS surveys in Nebraska. This is the logical location for the storage of this information. However, the SSO does not have adequate funding to be able to spearhead any ambitious framework development project for Nebraska and all it can do at this point is to urge private and county surveyors to record their various surveys in the repository database.

Item F- Ortho-base (Aerial Layer) or Base Maps: My notes are a bit sketchy at this point. Steve pointed out that although the DOQQ product appears adequate at the rural level, it is not sufficient to use as a vector mapping source for urban areas. Municipalities really require more detailed resolution. The DOQQ product is now 5 years old. There are more current (true color) Farm Service Agency orthos for a portion of Nebraska but these have slightly less resolution than the DOQQ.

Discussion veered into how the standards would be administered. Larry indicated that once it was formally adopted by the NITC, it would probably be under the administrative authority of the State CIO. In order for a county to obtain any funding, they would have to adhere to the standards. There was some uncertainty as to how it might be verified that the standards were adhered to. Perhaps a Council of ‘Wise Persons’ would have to be created to oversee that.

During this discussion, Larry handed out version 6 of LRM legislation text. One issue that has been sort of controversial has been the regionalization concept.

We next spent some time discussing Parcel Identification numbers. In response to a question by Bill, it was pointed out that this proposed structure was created several years ago in an attempt to blend with the DPAT format. It kept their format but altered the first field from what they call a geocode number and introduced a Township/Range/PM direction format. This is now viewed as too long and perhaps not workable. Someone made the suggestion that we drop J4 from this portion of the standards.

Larry asked us to spend some time thinking about various Data Layers and Data Sharing requirements that we may want to consider. He will also consult with Cathy about the JD Edwards project to see if we can integrate the two concepts in a more unified manner.

Dan provided us with some printouts relating to attribute data.

Next Meeting: **December 1st, 2004 1:00 PM. NDOR**

Post Note: Larry has scheduled a joint meeting of the LRM Standards Committee and the JD Edwards Work Group to take place at the above listed time and location.